

## REMARKS

Claims 1-63 were pending in the present application. Applicant amends Claims 1, 2, 5, 6, 9, 10, 13, 14, 16, 22, 30-48, 50-54, 56, and 58-63 to clarify claimed subject matter and/or correct informalities. The original specification and drawings support these claim amendments at least at pages 7, 9-13, 23-26, and Figures 2 and 4. Therefore, these revisions introduce no new matter. Claims 3, 4, 7, 8, 11, and 12 have been cancelled without prejudice.

Claims 1, 2, 5, 6, 9, 10, and 13-63 are for consideration upon entry of the present Amendment. Applicant requests favorable consideration of this response and allowance of the subject application based on the following remarks.

### *Allowable Subject Matter*

**A. Claims 4, 8, and 12 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claim and rewritten to overcome the §101 rejections (Office Action, page 8).** Applicant thanks the Examiner for indicating that these claims are allowable if rewritten to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims, and to overcome the §101 rejections.

Applicant amends independent **Claims 1, 5, and 9** to recite features formerly recited in allowable dependent Claims 4, 8, and 12, respectively and to recite features formerly recited in the intervening claims 3, 7, and 11, respectively. The amendments to independent Claims 1, 5, and 9 are purely of form (i.e., dependent format to independent format), and are

not to overcome prior art or any other objections. Accordingly, dependent Claims 3, 4, 7, 8, 11, and 12 have been cancelled without prejudice.

Applicant submits that independent Claims 1, 5, and 9 are in allowable form. Therefore, Applicant submits that Claims 1, 2, 5, 6, 9, and 10 are in condition for allowance.

**B. Claims 13-63 would be allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome the §101 rejections set forth in the office action** (Office Action, page 8). Applicant thanks the Examiner for indicating that Claims 13-63 would be allowed if rewritten to overcome the §101 rejections. Applicant appreciates the Examiner's assistance in expediting the prosecution.

Applicant amends independent **Claims 13, 30, and 47** to overcome the §101 rejections. For example, amended Claim 47 recites in part, "a display device coupled to the logic for outputting validation of selected information; and the logic determining a course of action in response to the validation" to illustrate a practical and useful purpose. Therefore, Applicant submits that Claims 13-63 are in condition for allowance.

**Amendment to the Specification**

The Office objected to the Abstract for a typographic error. Applicant amends the Abstract by replacing the word "so" with the word "to", to correct the typographic error in the Abstract. Applicant requests the objection be withdrawn.

**Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §101**

**Claims 1-63** stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 as being allegedly directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Applicant amends independent **Claims 1, 5, 9, 13, 30, and 47** to further clarify Applicant's subject matter for a practical and useful purpose. In particular, Applicant amends the claims to produce a useful, concrete, and tangible result. For example, amended Claim 1 recites in part, "outputting validation of selected information based on the determined Squared Tate pairing; and determining a course of action in response to validation of selected information. Support may be found at least at pages 7, 9-13, and in Figure 2. For example, amended Claim 30 recites "a computer storage medium" in addition to the features cited in Claim 1. Support may be found at least at pages 23-26 and Figure 4. Again, no new matter has been introduced.

**Dependent Claims 2, 6, 10, 14-29, 31-46, and 48-63** depend directly or indirectly from one of independent Claims 1, 5, 9, 13, 30, and 47 and are allowable by virtue of this dependency. These claims comply with §101 and as a result, these rejections are now moot. Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of these rejections.

**Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103**

**Claims 1-3, 5-7, and 9-11** stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Non-Patent Literature to Gerhard Frey, Michael Muller, and Hans-Georg Ruck; "The Tate Pairing and the Discrete Logarithm Applied to Elliptic Curve Cryptosystems" IEEE TRANSACTIONS ON INFORMATION THEORY, VOL. 45, NO. 5,

JULY 1999; Pages 1717-1719 (hereinafter "Frey"). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Applicant amends independent **Claims 1, 5, and 9** to recite features along the lines of allowable dependent Claims 4, 8, and 12, respectively and intervening Claims 3, 7, and 11, respectively. Accordingly, Claims 3, 7, and 11 have been canceled, thereby rendering moot the rejection of those claims. Claims 1, 5, and 9 have allowable subject matter.

**Dependent Claims 2, 6, and 10** depend directly from independent Claims 1, 5, and 9, and are allowable by virtue of this dependency. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the §103 rejections be withdrawn.

#### Conclusion

**Claims 1, 2, 5, 6, 9, 10, and 13-63** are in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and prompt allowance of the subject application. If any issue remains unresolved that would prevent allowance of this case, the Office is requested to contact the undersigned attorney to resolve the issue.

Respectfully Submitted,

Lee & Hayes, PLLC  
421 W. Riverside Avenue, Suite 500  
Spokane, WA 99201

Dated: 4-12-2007

By: Shirley Lee Anderson  
Shirley Lee Anderson  
Reg. No. 57,763  
(509) 324-9256 ext. 258